

the wonder is that it was as nearly perfect as it was. The Republicans immediately attacked it and magnified what they regarded as its dangers. If the matter could have been considered merely as an international question without partisanship being injected into it, the President and the Senate would have had little difficulty in reaching an agreement as to reservations. Partisanship is as paralyzing to calm thinking as alcohol and the person affected is as unconscious of being affected. It is one of the curious characteristics of partial intoxication that the man under its influence is quite sure that he is at his best. If he is shooting at a target he congratulates himself on his accuracy even if his bullets endanger bystanders. So with partisanship; the more partisan a man is the more sure he feels that he is actuated by a patriotic purpose almost holy in its disinterestedness. Both Democrats and Republicans were convinced that their opponents would agree with them but for their partisanship and the President was most unconscious of all of any partisan interest in the result.

Now, we are entering upon a campaign and the leaders of each party feel sure that they can win a partisan advantage by dragging this issue down into a partisan struggle and they congratulate themselves that they are doing it for a great, unselfish and patriotic purpose. It's a great national good that they are bent on achieving and it is merely a coincidence that in the opinion of both sides this can only be secured through a party victory.

Thus deluded they are staging a sham battle over a sham issue knowing while they do so that neither side can possibly secure two-thirds of the Senate at the coming election and knowing therefore that there must be a compromise at the end of the campaign if any agreement is to be reached. Just as the exhilarated toper deceives nobody but himself so these unconsciously partisan leaders are fooling themselves only. A large majority of the American people are infinitely more interested in getting this treaty ratified and the League of Nations established and out of the way than they are in the phraseology of reservations, and it is to this mass that our party ought to appeal. The partisans in both parties will vote the ticket anyhow no matter what the party says or does not say, but we never have had as many voters in the doubtful column as we have today. They do not care through what party relief comes if it only comes quickly. Just as the allies would rather have us come into the League with any reservations whatever than to stay out, so the average voter will regard time as the material factor and support the party that gives promise of immediate relief.

It is to this large element that our party ought to appeal and it is this element that I had in mind in urging a course different from any that has thus far been proposed. I venture to put on paper for the first time an outline of a plan which, in my judgment, will make the Democratic party victorious in this campaign because and only because it puts the country above the party and includes the civilized world in its calculations.

The plan:

"The Democratic party demands an amendment to the Federal constitution providing for ratification of treaties by a majority vote, so that it will be as easy to end a war as it is to declare war. Planting ourselves upon the most fundamental principle of popular government, namely, the right of the people to rule—a doctrine in support of which we have recently spent over \$25,000,000,000 of dollars and for which we have sacrificed 100,000 precious lives—we favor an immediate reconvening of the senate that this principle may be applied to the treaty controversy and ratification secured with such reservations as a majority of the senators may agree upon, reserving for the future the making of such changes as we may deem necessary.

"We favor appointment by the President with the consent of the senate of delegates to represent this nation in the league until regularly chosen delegates are elected and qualified.

"We favor the selection of the nation's delegates in the League of Nations by popular vote in districts in order that the people may speak through representatives of their own choice in the august tribunal which will consider the welfare of the world.

"These delegates should be instructed not

to vote for war without specific authority from congress or from the people given by referendum vote.

"Our nation's delegates should also be instructed to insist upon the disarmament of the world in order that the burden of militarism may be lifted from the shoulders of those who toil and the foundation of an enduring peace laid in friendship and cooperation."

The benefits of this plan may be briefly summarized as follows: The Democratic party plants itself upon an easily understood and easily defended principle of government. It has the votes to compel ratification immediately upon ascertaining the wishes of the majority of the Senate; it can by casting votes or withholding votes convert a majority into the two-thirds majority required by the constitution.

It can not only end the deadlock now but it offers a plan that will make future treaty deadlocks impossible and thus save the nation from the disgrace that this two-thirds provision has brought upon it. We alone of all the great nations have found it impossible to get out of war—a fact that impairs the value of our example in the countries that are striving to establish republics.

The plan presents a method of electing delegates that will insure to the people the right to choose their representatives in this great tribunal which offers to the world its only hope of peace.

By compelling the delegates to await authority from congress or from the American people direct before giving this nation sanction to war we answer practically all the objections that have been made to the covenant and yet do so in a manner entirely consistent with our nation's rights and the genius of our institutions.

When we instruct our delegates to demand universal disarmament we turn away from the false theories of the past—from the precedents that have written human history in characters of blood and hasten the coming of the day when the song of the angels—on earth peace, good will toward men—shall become an international anthem. The world is weary of war; enough tears have been shed within the last five years to wash all the sins of the world; enough blood has been poured out upon the earth to fertilize in every land the soil from which will spring the hopes of a new civilization.

Our allies owe us nearly ten billions of dollars which it will take them generations to pay and they cannot pay it without exacting from the vanquished a tool that will preclude the reestablishment of friendship. We can afford to use any part of this indebtedness that may be necessary to secure such a readjustment of the terms of the treaty as may be required to bring friends and foes into accord, so that the world may turn over a new leaf at once and the world's commerce be revived.

Such a plan would compel the Republicans to accept or reject the proposition offered. If they accepted it would remove the issue from politics, permit the consideration of pressing domestic problems, quicken the world's progress towards peace and win the undying gratitude of those who cry out against the cruel program of the militarists who would build a peace on terrorism.

If the Republicans rejected the plan they would forfeit the support of a large part of their party—the part that follows conscience and is not untrue to the vision of better things.

Such a plan cannot be considered a rejection of anything the President stands for; on the contrary, it is a vindication of the greatest purpose he has proclaimed, namely, to make the "world safe for democracy" and it opens a way by which he may during the remainder of his term become the moral leader of the world.

OFFERS PLAN FOR SETTLEMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

San Francisco, June 29.—The convention opened in regular style with incitements calculated to unloose any lurking spirit of enthusiasm. The flag was unfurled when the Star Spangled Banner was sung. When a large-sized picture of the president was unveiled, the convention had its first opportunity to give vent to its feelings. The demonstration lasted for some twenty minutes, during which the delegates marched through the aisles carrying the standards of the states and cheering lustily.

The applause was renewed when Temporary Chairman Cummings referred to the president and the treaty.

Mr. Cummings' speech was well received and it embodied as such a speech should, a review of Democratic achievements—not a complete review for, singularly, it omitted all reference to prohibition—the greatest party achievement to which our party can lay claim. It would seem impossible were it not actually true that any Democrat large enough to be considered for a keynote speech could be terrorized into silence by the friends of the saloon even after the liquor traffic has been barred by constitutional amendment, and that amendment enforced by criminal law sustained in every respect by the supreme court of the land. And yet there are some who think that the question should be avoided on the theory that it is dead. When did a corpse ever before possess such a power to frighten? If the avoidance of the subject is due to political expediency, what an indictment of the defenders of the home that their zeal should so little impress politicians. But Chairman Cummings hails from one of the three states that failed to ratify, and a recent convention in his state declared for wine and beer. He may have thoughtlessly mistaken this for a state convention. The delegates from the remaining forty-five states may repair the harm he has done by adopting a dry plank congratulating the party on its honorable part in this great moral victory.

Mr. Gompers is here and will doubtless be heard by the resolutions committee. He is not likely to have any difficulty in securing a recognition for all the rights of labor for this is quite a different convention from that which assembled in Chicago three weeks ago. I shall ask the committee to include in the platform a provision for a permanent investigating commission with a view to settling industrial disputes before they reach the strike or lockout stage. At present the third party, as the public seems to be ignored, and yet it is the public that furnishes the money for both employer and employe. The need for some such plan was forcibly emphasized last fall when a strike threatened to close the coal mines just before the beginning of winter. The mine workers numbered between five and six hundred thousand, and the number of stockholders in the mines could not have amounted to many hundred thousand. The most extravagant estimate would not put the number of men interested on both sides at more than a million. Counting five persons to a family, not more than five million men, women, and children could have been directly interested in the controversy, and yet it looked for a while as if the remaining 95,000,000 of our people would have to freeze while the dispute was being adjusted. Believing that compulsory arbitration is not compatible with American ideas, but that the public has a right to know the facts in any dispute that affects the general welfare, I shall submit for the consideration of the committee a very simple plan which is identical in its general provisions with the treaty plan embodied in thirty treaties with three-quarters of the world and afterwards made the cornerstone of the League of Nations. Even before I suggested it for international disputes I endeavored to have it applied to industrial disputes. It contemplates a permanent board of three members, one chosen from the classes assumed to be in sympathy with the employer, one from the classes supposed to be in sympathy with the employe, and the third selected with a view to find a person as nearly impartial as possible. This commission should have authority to investigate an industrial dispute at the request of either side or upon its own initiative. In each dispute two members would be added to the commission, one chosen by each side in order that each side might be sure to have a representative on the commission. The report of the commission would not be binding on either side, but would be a guide to public opinion. Such a commission would not make strikes impossible, but the fact that such an investigation could be made would go far toward compelling conciliation and the establishment of such a means of adjusting disputes would reduce to a minimum the inflaming of prejudice, just as a peaceful means of settling international disputes is calculated to lessen the partisan propaganda that in itself increases the probability of a conflict.

Is it not worth while to keep in mind justice